UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,760	10/19/2004	Hirohisa Miyazawa	029267.55527US	6723

23911 7590 10/26/2006

CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER	
WEISKOPF, MARIE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3661	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,760	MIYAZAWA, HIROHISA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marie A. Weiskopf	3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6-8,10,12 and 14-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *14-17* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6,7,10,18 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *8 and 12* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/27/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6-7, 10 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiyama (US 6,427,115) in view of Hashima et al (US 6,816,783).

- In regard to claim 1, Sekiyama discloses a display device which is a sub-device comprising:
  - A first arithmetic processing unit (Column 4, lines 30-32)
  - A display unit at which information is displayed as a bitmap (Column 4, lines 30-32)
  - An interface unit that can be connected with an external information processing apparatus having a second arithmetic processing unit which executes a specific type of processing (Column 4, lines 30-32)
  - The first arithmetic processing unit controls the display unit so as to display information related to the specific type of processing transmitted from the external information processing apparatus or on-vehicle device and also executes another type of processing related to the specific type of processing based upon an instruction provided by the external information processing apparatus. (Column 4, lines 59-67)

- The specific type of processing executed at the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals. (Column 4, lines 1-5)
- The another type of processing executed at the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search. (Column 5, lines 1-12)

Sekiyama fails to disclose the second arithmetic processing unit having a drive device that reads road data from a CD-ROM or a DVD and processing for reading the road data with the drive device and further uses the road map data with the drive device in the external information processing apparatus, however, it is common and very well known in the art to have a drive device in order to be able to read map data as is taught by Hashima et al. (Column 2, lines 42-48) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a drive device in order to be able to quickly load the map data as has been done with navigation systems for a long time due to the large memory size as discussed by Hashima et al.

- In regard to claim 2, Sekiyama discloses an information processing apparatus which is the main device comprising:
  - An interface unit that can be connected with a display device having a first arithmetic processing unit and a display unit controlled by the first

arithmetic processing unit, at which information is displayed as a bitmap (Column 3, 62-67)

- A second arithmetic processing unit that executes a specific type of processing (Column 3, lines 62-67), wherein:
  - The second arithmetic processing unit issues an instruction to have the first arithmetic processing unit at the display device execute another type of processing related to the specific type of processing (Column 4, lines 1-29)
  - The specific type of processing executed at the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals. (Column 4, lines 1-5)
  - The another type of processing executed at the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search. (Column 5, lines 1-12)

Sekiyama fails to disclose the second arithmetic processing unit having a drive device that reads road data from a CD-ROM or a DVD and processing for reading the road data with the drive device and further uses the road map data with the drive device in the external information processing apparatus, however, it is common and very well known in the art to have a drive device in order to be able to read map data as is taught by Hashima et al. (Column 2, lines 42-48) It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a drive device in order to be able to quickly load the map data as has been done with navigation systems for a long time due to the large memory size as discussed by Hashima et al.

- In regard to claims 6 and 7, Sekiyama fails to disclose a second display unit smaller in size than the display unit of the display device, however, this is purely a design choice. Sekiyama discloses the on-vehicle device and the portable device each being capable of having a display. (See Figure 1; Column 4, lines 23-29) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the display screen of the on-vehicle navigation unit smaller than the portable or display device because the main display screen is provided by the portable terminal. Also, Sekiyama does not explicitly state that the second display unit displays only a straight or bent arrow, however, Sekiyama shows this (See Fig. 4b) and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention not to display as much information on this screen in order to provide the user with clear information for the navigation.
- In regard to claim 18, Sekiyama discloses an information processing system comprising:
    - A display device which is the portable device
    - An information processing apparatus which is the on-vehicle device, wherein:

- The information processing apparatus comprises an interface unit that can be connected with the display device and a second arithmetic processing unit that executes a specific type of processing. (Column 3, 62-67)
- The display device comprises a first arithmetic processing unit, a display unit at which information is displayed as a bitmap, and an interface unit that can be connected with the information processing apparatus. (Column 4, lines 30-32)
- The second arithmetic processing unit issues an instruction to have the first arithmetic processing unit at the display device execute another type of processing related to the specific type of processing. (Column 4, lines 1-29)
- The first arithmetic processing unit controls the display unit so as to display information related to the specific type of processing transmitted from the external information processing apparatus or on-vehicle device and also executes another type of processing related to the specific type of processing based upon an instruction provided by the external information processing apparatus. (Column 4, lines 59-67)
- The specific type of processing executed at the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that

contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals. (Column 4, lines 1-5)

- The other type of processing executed at the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search. (Column 5, lines 1-12)

Sekiyama fails to disclose the second arithmetic processing unit having a drive device that reads road data from a CD-ROM or a DVD and processing for reading the road data with the drive device and further uses the road map data with the drive device in the external information processing apparatus, however, it is common and very well known in the art to have a drive device in order to be able to read map data as is taught by Hashima et al. (Column 2, lines 42-48) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a drive device in order to be able to quickly load the map data as has been done with navigation systems for a long time due to the large memory size as discussed by Hashima et al.

- In regard to claim 10, which is an information processing system according to claim 18, Sekiyama discloses wherein:
  - The information processing apparatus further includes a radio tuner (Column 4, lines 41-51)
  - The second arithmetic processing unit executes audio processing. (Column 3, lines 46-50)

- In regard to claim 19, Sekiyama fails to disclose specifically the display device or portable terminal being capable of working with a second information processing apparatus. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow any portable terminal of the system to work with any information processing apparatus and only executing the processing related to that information processing apparatus. The portable terminal or display device discussed by Sekiyama also serves as a portable telephone and it would be obvious to allow that portable telephone to work with any information processing apparatus or on-vehicle device in any car so that the user would be capable of driving any car and not just one car with one on-vehicle navigation apparatus.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 14-17 are allowed.

2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art, individually or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest a display device connected with a first information processing apparatus to achieve a first information processing system, connected with the second information processing apparatus to achieve a second processing system and executes another type of processing when the interface unit is connected with the first information processing apparatus to achieve the first information processing system and the first arithmetic processing unit does not execute the another type of processing related to the first processing, when the interface unit is connected with the second information processing apaparatus to achieve the second information processing.

3. Claims 8 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/06 in regard to claims 6 and 7 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to claims 6 and 7, changing the size of the display screen is purely a design choice and does not alter the invention in any way. Having one screen bigger than the other serves no special purpose and would therefore be obvious to one of routine skill in the art to change the size of the displays to suit the need of the user.

5. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 14 and 15, filed 8/02/06, with respect to claims 8, 12 and 14 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marie A. Weiskopf whose telephone number is (571) 272-6288. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:00 AM and 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MW

THOMAS BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER